

## FINANCE DEPARTMENT

The 15th October, 1974

**No. 8400-WM(5)-74/40002.** In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (2) of Article 283 of the Constitution of India, and all other powers enabling in this behalf, the Governor of Haryana hereby makes the following rules further to amend the Punjab Financial Rules, Volume I, in their application to the State of Haryana, namely:—

1. These rules may be called the Punjab Financial (Haryana Eighth Amendment) Rules, Volume I, 1974.
  2. In the Punjab Financial Rules, Volume I, in rule 19.11, after Serial No. 3, the following Serial No. 4 shall be inserted, namely:
  4. To sanction the remission of penal interest on loans granted under the Punjab State Aid to Industries Act, 1935 and the rules made thereunder found irrecoverable or when, from any special cause or on compassionate grounds, it appears that the same ought not to be recovered.
- |   |  |
|---|--|
| Secretary to Government Haryana, Industries Department. | Full powers where loans upto Rs 1,500 in an individual case, were advanced". |
|---|--|

The 20th November, 1974

**No. 5368-FR (PRC)-74/40415.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by the proviso to Article 309 of the Constitution of India and all other powers enabling him in this behalf, the Governor of Haryana hereby makes the following rules further to amend the Haryana Civil Services and Posts (Revised Scales of Pay) Rules, 1969, namely:—

1. These rules may be called the Haryana Civil Services and Posts (Revised Scales of Pay) (Second Amendment) Rules, 1974.
2. These rules shall come into force with effect from 1st February, 1969.
3. In the Haryana Civil Services and Posts (Revised Scales of Pay) Rules, 1969, in the Schedule appended thereto:—
  - (i) For Serial No. 37 and existing entries against it at page 15, the following shall be substituted:—

1	2	3	4	5
37 (i)	Forest Guards	25/- fixed	70—1—80/1—85	
(ii)	Weighman	25/- fixed	60/-fixed	
(iii)	Against Serial No. 38 at page 15 in column 4, for the scale "Rs. 55/-fixed", the scale "70—1—80/1—85" shall be substituted.			
(iv)	Against Serial No. 10 at page 27 under the heading "Technical Education Department" in column 4, for the existing scale "150—10—200/10—300", the scale "160—10—280/15—400" shall be substituted.			
(v)	Against Serial No. 5 at page 22 under the heading "Directorate of Urban Estate" in column 4, for the scale "160—10—280/15—400", the scale "200—10—280/15—430—20—450" shall be substituted.			
(vi)	Against Serial No. 27 at page 27 in column 4 under the heading "Technical Education Department," for the scale "70—1—80/1—85", the scale "70—2—80/3—95" shall be substituted.			
(vii)	Against Serial No. 28 at page 27 in column 4 under the heading "Technical Education Department", for the scale "70—1—80/1—85", the scale "70—2—80/3—95" shall be substituted.			

1. In the Haryana Civil Services and Posts (Revised Scales of Pay) Rules, 1969, in the Supplementary Schedule I appended thereto:—

(i) Against Serial No. 34, page 3 in column 3, for the existing entry "70—4—90/5—120", the following shall be substituted:—

70—4—90/5—120

70—4—90

(ii) After Serial No. 16 at page 6 under the heading "Agriculture Department", the following new Serial No. 17 shall be inserted:—

1	2	3	4
17.	Fieldman	32—1—42 (personal scale)	70—2—80/3—95

(iii) After Serial No. 63 at page 4 under the heading "Health Department", the following new Serial No. 64 shall be inserted:—

1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
64.	Book Binder	50—3—80	90—3—120/4—140	

(iv) After Serial No. 3, at page 6 under the heading "Transpost Department", the following new Serial No. 4 shall be inserred:—

1	2	3	4	5
4.	Junior Auditor	80—5—150/10—220	160—10—280/15—400	

S. N. BHANOT, Commissioner and Secy.

#### INDUSTRIES DEPARTMENT

The 15th November, 1974

No. 7032-1IBII-74/40050.—Whereas it appears to the Governor of Haryana that land specified below is likely to be needed by the Government, at public expence, for a public purposes, namely, for the setting up of an Industrial Development Colony at Jakhal, district Hissar, it is hereby notified that the land in the locality specified below is likely to be required for the above purpose.

This notification is made under the provisions of section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894, for the information of all to whom it may concern.

In exercise of the powers conferred by the aforesaid section, the Governor of Haryana hereby authorises the Collector, Hissar, with such other officers and officials, for the time being engaged in the undertaking, to enter upon and survey any land in the locality and do all other acts required or permitted by that section.

Plans of the land may be inspected in the office of the Collector, Hissar.

Any person interested who has any objection to the acquisition of land in the locality may, within a period of thirty days of the publication of this notification in the Official Gazette, file objections, if any in writing before the Collector, Hissar District.

## SPECIFICATION

District	Tehsil	Locality	Khasra No.	Area
1	2	3	4	5
Kanal Marla				
Hissar	Fatehabad	Village Jakhal	25/6	8—0
			15	8—0
			16/1	5—15
			26/9	8—0
			10	8—0
			11	8—0
			12	8—0
			19/1	7—2
			20	8—0
			26/19/2	0—18
			22	7—6
			21/1/2	4—14
			21/3/2	0—12
Grand Total				.. 82—7

The 22nd November, 1974

No. 10710-2IB (1)-74/40702.—In pursuance of the provisions of sub-section (1) of Section 7 of the State Financial Corporations Act, 1951 (Act No. LXIII of 1951), the Governor of Haryana on the recommendation of the Board of Directors of Haryana Financial Corporation based on the advice of Reserve Bank of India is pleased to fix 9 % per annum as the rate of interest payable on the Bond of the value of Rs. 50.00 lakhs (Rupees fifty lakhs only) to be issued by the Haryana Financial Corporation in 1974 and maturing on 28th May, 1975.

No. 10710-2IB (1)-74/40710.—In pursuance of the provisions of sub-section (1) of Section 7 of the State Financial Corporation, Act, 1951 (Act No. LXIII of 1951), the Governor of Haryana hereby guarantees the repayment of the principal and payment of interest, at the rate of 9 % per annum in respect of the Bond of the value of Rs. 50.00 lakhs (Rupees fifty lakhs only) to be issued by the Haryana Financial Corporation in 1974 and maturing on the 28th of May, 1975.

M. J SETH, Commissioner and Secy.



## LABOUR AND EMPLOYMENT DEPARTMENT

The 5th November, 1974

No. 10007-4Lab-74/34501.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Lakshmirattan Engineering Works Ltd., Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI O.P. SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA, ROHTAK

Reference No. 151 of 1971

*between*

SHRI ADARSH KISHORE AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S LAKSHMIRATTAN ENGINEERING WORKS LTD., FARIDABAD

Present :

Shri Madhusudan Saran Kaushish, for the workman.

Shri R.C. Sharma, for the management.

AWARD

Shri Adarsh Kishore workman concerned was in the service of M/s Lakshmirattan Engineering Works Ltd., Faridabad since before August, 1969. His services were terminated by the management but in the conciliation proceedings started on his demand notice, a settlement was arrived at between him and the management on 10th September, 1969 before the Conciliation Officer and the management agreed to re-appoint him on probation for 6 months with effect from 11th September, 1969.—*vide* copy of the settlement Ex. M.1. He was given the letter of appointment in terms of the settlement on 11th September, 1969, copy Ex. M.2, wherein also it was provided that his appointment was on probation for 6 months but the period of probation was extendable by further 6 months. The management however terminated his services with effect from 21st March, 1970. Feeling aggrieved, he raised a demand for reinstatement but without any success. His case was taken up by the General Engineering Mazdoor Union Regd. (INTUC), N.I.T., Faridabad and demand notice was given to the management asking for his reinstatement and payment of back wages, but there was no response. The matter was then taken up for conciliation which also ended in failure.

On receipt of the failure report from the Conciliation Officer, the Governor of Haryana referred the dispute for adjudication to this court, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (i) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947,—*vide* Order No. ID/FD/15T/16372—76, dated 2nd June, 1971, with the following term of reference :—

“Whether the termination of services of Shri Adarsh Kishore was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?”

The parties put in their respective pleadings. The management contested the claim of the workman on merits pleading *inter alia* that Shri Adarsh Kishore workman concerned had no *locus standi* to raise the dispute and Shri Amar Singh office bearer of the General Engineering Mazdoor Union Regd. (INTUC), N.I.T., Faridabad had no *locus standi* to serve the demand notice. The settlement of 10th September, 1969 referred to above was, however, not disputed but it was alleged that Shri Adarsh Kishore had committed certain acts of mis-conduct and the several warnings issued to him had no effect. He was, therefore, charge-sheeted and was found guilty in the enquiry for which he was awarded the punishment of suspension for 5 days from 21st February, 1970 to 25th February, 1970 but he had intentionally refused to accept service of this order and started remaining absent from duty with effect from 20th February, 1970 without any prior permission and intimation. It was also stated that the initial period of his probation came to an end on 10th March, 1970 and the management was not bound to keep him in service beyond this period. However, a letter was issued to him on 11th March, 1970 that his probation period had been extended but this letter was received back as refused and the same was then put up on the notice board of the Company. Lastly, it was urged in the written statement that since Shri Adarsh Kishore was only on probation and had committed a number of acts of mis-conduct and his work was otherwise not satisfactory, the management was within its right to terminate his services on 21st March, 1970 and the termination letter was communicated to him by registered post at his house address and a copy was also exhibited on the notice board. The workman controverted the above allegations of the management and reiterated his demand for reinstatement as earlier raised through the demand notice leading to the present reference. My learned predecessor framed the following preliminary issue on 17th November, 1971 :—

1. Whether the reference is invalid for the reasons stated in the preliminary objections?

Before the parties led their evidence on the above issue, the following issue on merits was also framed on their request :—

1. Whether the termination of services of Shri Adarsh Kishore was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

No evidence has been led on behalf of the management except for tendering in evidence copies of documents, Exs. M. 1 to M. 30, including the copy of settlement referred to above, letter of appointment, warnings given to the workman from time to time, the charge-sheet of mis-conduct served upon him, his explanation to the charge-sheet, enquiry proceedings including the report of the Enquiry Officer, the show cause notice given to the workman and the final order of the termination of his services, dated 21st March, 1970.

The workman has made his own statement on oath and relied upon four documents including copies of the complaints made to the management that he was not allowed to take part in the enquiry, Exs. W.1 to W. 4.

Arguments have been addressed on both sides and some authorities have also been cited. I have given a very careful consideration to the material on record and the contentions raised by the learned representatives of the parties. The issues may be taken up separately.

*Issue No. 1.*—Nothing worth consideration has been urged with regard to this issue and it has not been shown as to how the General Engineering Mazdoor Union Regd. (INTUC), N.I.T., Faridabad was not competent to raise the dispute on behalf of the present workman by giving the demand notice to the management and by taking up the matter for conciliation when there was no satisfactory response. The issue is, therefore, decided against the management and in favour of the workman.

*Issue No. 2.*—As for the merits of the case, the management has led no satisfactory evidence to justify the termination of the services of the present workman. As already pointed out, his services had been terminated earlier also sometime in 1969 but on his demand notice a settlement was arrived at under section 12(3) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 in the conciliation proceedings,—*vide* copy of the settlement Ex. M.1 on record. The management had agreed to re-appoint him on probation for 6 months with effect from 11th November, 1969 and on that date a regular letter of appointment was issued to him which also provided that his appointment was on probation for 6 months which was, however, extendable by further 6 months. The initial period of probation expired on 10th March, 1970 but instead of dispensing with his services, although according to the management, he had been given several warnings, the period of probation was extended by another 3 months, i.e., 9th June, 1970. The management, however, terminated his services only after 10 days of the extension of the period of probation. It has been stated that there were charges of misconduct against him for which an enquiry was held and he was found guilty by the Enquiry Officer. No legal evidence has, however, been produced in the case to prove the so called enquiry and the warnings alleged to have been given to this workman from time to time. The original records of the enquiry have not been brought on the record and only copies have been tendered in evidence. The Enquiry Officer has not come into the witness-box nor has any other official of the Company been examined to establish the charges levelled against this workman.

It has been vehemently argued on behalf of the management that the impugned action of the termination of the services has not been taken against this workman by way of punishment as a result of any enquiry or findings of the Enquiry Officer. It was only an order of termination simpliciter without attaching any stigma against him and the order having been passed in terms of his appointment he was not competent to challenge the validity of the same. The contention, I am afraid, has no force in the context of the facts brought on record. According to the management, this workman was guilty of charges of misconduct and had not improved his work inspite of several warnings given to him, he was charge-sheeted and an enquiry was also held into his conduct. The workman has placed on record copies of 4 complaints made by him to the management that he was not allowed to take part in the enquiry proceedings. In the circumstances, it cannot be held that the impugned order of the termination of the services of this workman was tantamount to only termination simpliciter and my considered view is that the management had been actuated by *mala fide* motives in dispensing with his services. The argument that the order was passed in terms of his appointment also does not hold good. Although, according to the original settlement of 10th September, 1969 brought about in conciliation proceedings under section 12(3) of the Industrial Disputes Act the management had agreed to re-appoint him on probation for 6 months. But in the letter of appointment which was issued to him on 11th September, 1969 it was clearly provided that the period of probation was extendable by further 6 months. The initial period of probation expired on 10th March, 1970, but on the same day it was further extended by another 3 months, i.e., upto 9th June, 1970. As already pointed out, the services of this workman were terminated only after 10 days or so on 21st March, 1970, without waiting for the expiry of the extended period of probation and no evidence worth consideration has been brought on record to indicate that his work during the intervening period or so had not been satisfactory or that he had committed any misconduct in the discharge of his duties which rendered him as an undesirable person to be kept in service any longer.

So, on the facts established in the case and for the reasons aforesaid, the termination of the services of the present workman can by no stretch of imagination be considered to be justified and in order. Issue No. 2 is accordingly decided in his favour holding that he is entitled to reinstatement with continuity of previous service and full back wages. He is also entitled to Rs 100 as costs of the present proceedings. The award is made accordingly.

Dated, the 24th October, 1974.

O. P. SHARMA,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana,  
Rohtak.

No. 2554, dated the 29th October, 1974.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government of Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

O. P. SHARMA,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana,  
Rohtak.

The 12th November, 1974

**No. 10320-4Lab-74/34537.**—In pursuance of the provisions of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Hindustan Ko-Ko-Ku Wire Ltd., Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI O. P. SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA, ROHTAK

Reference No. 152 of 1971

*between*

**SHRI RAMA SHANKER RAI AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S HINDUSTAN KO-KO-KU WIRE LTD., MATHURA ROAD, FARIDABAD**

*Present.—*

Shri Sagar Ram Gupta, for the workman.

Shri S. L. Gupta, for the management.

#### AWARD

Shri Rama Shanker Rai, workman concerned was in the service of M/s Hindustan Ko-Ko-Ku Wire Ltd., Mathura Road, Faridabad since 18th December, 1970. The management terminated his services on 19th February, 1971 allegedly without any justification. Feeling aggrieved, he approached the management for reinstatement but without success. This gave rise to an industrial dispute. The matter was taken up for conciliation by means of demand notice, dated 26th February, 1971 which also ended in failure.

On receipt of the failure report from the Conciliation Officer, the Governor of Haryana, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 referred the above dispute for adjudication to this court,—*vide* order No. ID/FD/151-B-71/28556-60, dated 17th September, 1971, with the following term of reference :—

“Whether the termination of services of Shri Rama Shanker Rai was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?”

The parties put in their respective pleadings. The management contested the claim of the workman on the grounds that he had taken part in the strike of the workers in the factory and had then absented himself from duty without any proper authorisation and his name was, therefore, struck off the rolls with effect from 28th January, 1971 under the Certified Standing Orders of the Company. It was further pleaded that the reference was invalid because the demand, the subject matter, of the present reference had never been raised by the workman on the management. The following two issues arose for determination from the pleadings of the parties :—

(1) Whether the reference is invalid ?

(2) Whether the termination of services of Shri Rama Shanker Rai was justified in and order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

The management has examined one witness Shri O. P. Tyagi, Personnel Officer, M.W. 1 and reliance has been placed upon six documents including office note of the Time-keeper regarding absence from duty of Shri Rama Shanker Rai, workman concerned, M.W. 1/1, order of the Works Manager on this note, Ex. M.W. 1/2, Medical Certificate of Shri T. K. Sinha, dated 20th January, 1971, Ex. M.W. 1/3, letter of the management written to Shri Rama Shanker Rai on 1st February, 1971, Ex. M.W. 1/4, another Medical Certificate of the same Doctor, dated 4th February, 1971, Ex. M.W. 1/5 and letter, dated 12th February, 1971 of the management to the workman, Ex. M.W. 1/6.

Shri Rama Shanker Rai, workman concerned has made his own statement besides examining Shri Ved Ram, co-worker, W.W. 2. The documentary evidence produced by him consists of E.S.I.C. dispensary certificate, Ex. W.W. 1/1, letter written to the management by Shri H.R. Dua on his behalf on 18th February, 1971, Ex. W.W. 1/2, A.D. receipt, Ex. W.W. 1/3, copy of the demand notice, dated 26th February, 1971, Ex. W.W. 1/4, extract from the standing Orders of the Company, Ex. W.W. 1/5, Medical Certificate of Dr. T. K. Sinha, dated 15th February, 1971, Ex. W.W. 1/6, postal receipts, Exs. W.W. 1/7 and W.W. 1/8.

The case has been fully argued on both sides and I have given a very careful consideration to the evidence on record and the contentions raised by the learned representatives of the parties. It is admitted on both sides that there was a strike in the factory which ended on 18th January, 1971. According to the management, the present workman did not report for duty on 19th January, 1971 and remained absent without any proper authorisation till 28th January, 1971 when his name was struck off the rolls under the Certified Standing Orders of the Company. On the other hand, the workman has alleged that, as a matter of fact, he had been taken ill on 12th January, 1971 and since his condition did not improve he left for his village on 18th January, 1971 where he got treatment from Dr. T. K. Sinha and send medical certificates were sent to the management requesting for leave and further extension because the Medical Officer had advised him rest and when he was declared fit he reported for duty in the factory on 17th February, 1971 and worked for two hours but the Works Manager asked him to stop work as his name had been struck off the rolls. The Certified Standing Orders of the Company do provide as per clause 19(d) that if a workman remains absent from duty without any proper authorisation consecutively for 8 days he would be deemed to have left service and it would result into loss of lien on the post held by him. In the instant case, however, in the context of the facts established on record it can not be said that the absence of the present workman from duty during the period in question was unauthorised or without any justification. He has succeeded in proving that he had been taken ill on 12th January, 1971,—*vide* E.S.I.C. Medical Certificate, Ex. W.W. 1/1. The workers were admittedly on strike during this period which according to the statement of the Personnel Officer, M.W. 1 was called off on 18th January, 1971. The present workman had, however, left for his village due to his illness and the question of his reporting for duty on 19th January, 1971 did not arise. He had sent two medical certificates from Dr. T.K. Sinha Exs. M.W. 1/3 dated 20th January, 1971 and Ex. M.W. 1/5, dated 4th February, 1971 advising him rest till 17th February, 1971. The receipt of these Medical Certificates has not been denied and the same have been produced by the management itself. It has been argued that these certificates were not accompanied by any covering letter asking for the extension of the leave although the workman has sworn testimony to the contrary. Otherwise also, it does not stand to reason that the workman would send the Medical Certificate to the management without asking for the extension of his leave. There was no sense in sending the certificates if he did not want leave or extension of the same for the period prescribed by the Doctor who was treating him. His statement finds further corroboration in the testimony of the co-worker Shri Ved Ram who had taken him to the factory on his cycle. Accordingng to Shri Ved Ram, Shri Rama Shanker Rai had reported for duty on 17th February, 1971 and worked for two hours or so. The fitness certificate which has been produced by the workman as Ex. M.W. 1/6, dated 15th February, 1971 also shows that he was fit to resume his duty. No evidence to the contrary has been produced by the management to show that this workman was, in fact, not taken ill and that he had intentionally remained absent from duty.

So, taking into consideration all the facts of the case discussed together, I am of the considered view that the present workman had to remain absent from duty after the strike had been called off on 18th January, 1971 due to un-avoidable circumstances of his continuous illness till 15th February, 1971. He had sent intimation of his illness to the management during the prescribed period of 8 days as per clause 19 (d) of the Certified Standing Orders of the Company explaining the cause of his absence from duty which was justifiable as discussed above. The management was, therefore, wrong in striking his name off the rolls on 28th January, 1971 and not allowing him to work in the factory after he had been declared fit and had actually put in work for two hours or so on 17th February, 1971. No official concerned of the department where he was working has been examined to contradict this fact. So, for the reasons aforesaid, the termination of the services of the present workman can not be held to be justified and in order.

As for the plea of the invalidity of the reference, raised on behalf of the management covered by issue No. 1, there is not much to discuss. The workman concerned had actually given the demand notice to the management through Shri H. R. Dua on 18th February, 1971 — *vide* Ex. W.W. 1/2 before raising the regular dispute by means of the demand notice, dated 26th February, 1971 which forms part of the present reference. By means of the letter, dated 18th February, 1971, he had questioned the validity of the termination of his services and requested the management to reinstate him with full back wages. The demand notice dated 26th February, 1971 whereupon conciliation proceedings were started was given later when no satisfactory response was received from the management to the above letter. It can not, therefore, be said by any stretch of imagination that the demand had not been first raised on the management and rejected by it before taking up the matter for conciliation so as to constitute an industrial dispute in accordance within the rule of law laid down by Hon'ble the Supreme Court in the Sindhu Re-settlement Corporation case. Issue No. 1 is accordingly decided against the management.

In view of my above findings on issue No. 2 that the termination of the services of the present workman was not justified and in order for the detailed reasons already discussed, he is entitled to reinstatement and the issue is accordingly decided in his favour and against the management.

Besides reinstatement, the workman has claimed back wages but he has not made out a good case for the same. His statement is silent on the point that he has not been gainfully employed anywhere during the intervening period. It will not be out of place to consider here that the management had raised a specific plea vide application dated 5th July, 1973 that he had been gainfully employed and evidence could be led to this effect. Inspite of this plea, however, the workman could not have the courage to come into the witness box and make a statement on oath denying the above plea of the management. In the circumstances, it is not a fit case for allowing back wages to the workman concerned.

In the light of my above observations, I hold that the termination of the services of the present workman is not justified and in order and, in the result, he is entitled to reinstatement with continuity of previous service but without any back wages. The award is made accordingly. There shall be no order as to costs.

O. P. SHARMA,

Dated 24th October, 1974.

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana,  
Rohtak.

No. 2573, dated 1st November 1974.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government of Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under-section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

O. P. SHARMA,

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana,  
Rohtak.

MISS M. SETH, Secy.

#### AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT

The 22nd November, 1974

No. 7980-Agr 1 (I)-74/27111.—The Governor of Haryana is pleased to retire Shri Jal Lal Dalal, Additional Director of Agriculture, Haryana, H. A. S. Class I, from Government service with effect from 16th June, 1974 (Forenoon) on the expiry of the period of extension of service beyond the age of superannuation (i. e. 58 years) granted,—vide Haryana Government order No. 7980 Agr1(I)-74/26301, dated 8th November, 1974.

V. P. JOHAR,

Financial Commissioner and Secy.

#### ANIMAL HUSBANDRY DEPARTMENT

The 20th November, 1974

No. 10295-AH(3)-74/26990.—The Governor of Haryana is pleased in consultation with the Haryana Public Service Commission to promote Shri D. R. Maulick, in H.V.S. II, in an officiating capacity, in the scale of Rs. 350—25—500/30—590/20—830/35—900 (Now revised to Rs. 400—30—700/40—1100) with effect from 14th April, 1969. He is further with effect from the same date appointed as Officer-in-charge, Stock Assistant Training Class.

V. P. JOHAR,

Financial Commissioner and Secy.

#### IRRIGATION DEPARTMENT

The 15th November, 1974

No. 6181/FCD/619, 69.—Whereas it appears to the Governor of Haryana that injury to land public health or public convenience may arise from the obstruction of the under mentioned rivers, streams or drainage channel.

Now therefore, the Governor of Haryana in exercise of the powers conferred by section 55 of the Northern India Canal and Drainage Act, VIII of 1873 (as amended by Act XXVI of 1899, Act IV of 1914 and Act XXXVIII of 1920), is hereby pleased to prohibit the formation of any obstruction in the under-mentioned drainage channel and to order to the removal or modification of existing obstruction within the limits defined in the following statement.

No. S.	Name of Drainage Line	District	Tehsil	Village	Description and limits of drainage line to be declared		Direction of Drain with respect to north line	Description of existing obstruction to be removed modified	Place where Plan to be inspected
					R. D.	From	To	Width in feet	
1	Construction of Panipat main drain	Karnal	Panipat	Nurpur Gujran	2411	3000	104'.50	Strips of land varying in width lying generally in the direction of flow of surface water in Karnal	Any obstruction which will interfere with easy Office Executive, Engineer, Division, Karnal
		Karnal	Panipat	Nurpur Gujran	9350	9913	66'. 0		
		Do	Do	Dasina Khurd	15529	16370	55'. 0		
		Do	Do	Kheri Nagal	27379	31448	93'. 5	East to the drain South-West	Drain-
		Do	Do	Sarae Pilkhan	32276	33010	66'. 0	as demarcated at site	Division,
		Do	Do	Sarae Pilkhan	33010	33290	71'.50	and shown on the Index	Karnal
		Do	Do	Sarae Pilkhan	33290	33665	77'. 0	Plan	
		Do	Do	Kabul Bagh	46580	48030	110'. 0		
		Do	Do	Panipat Taraf Ansar	51276	51730	33'. 0		
		Do	Do	Panipat Taraf Ansar	52372	53197	33'. 0		
		Do	Do	Panipat Taraf Ansar	53197	53791	71'.50		
		Do	Do	Panipat Taraf Ansar	53791	55812	104'.50		
		Do	Do	Panipat Taraf Ansar	55812	57437	93'.50		
		Do	Do	Panipat Taraf Rajputan	57437	63860	60'.50		
		Do	Do	Panipat Taraf Ansar	63860	64257	71'.56		
		Do	Do	Muhammad	75296	76250	82'.50		

Counter signed SUKHDEV PRASAD, Collector, Karnal.	Counter signed B. C. MALHOTRA, Superintending Engineer, Drainage Circle, Karnal.	R. K. BHATIA, Executive Engineer, Karnal Drainage Division, Karnal.	S. DOGRA, Deputy Secretary to Government, Haryana, Irrigation and Power Department, Chandigarh.
---	---	--	--